



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/704,498	11/06/2003	Justin K. Brask	42P17821	3238

7590 11/07/2005

Michael A. Bernadicou  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
Seventh Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

CHEN, KIN-CHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/704,498

**Applicant(s)**

BRASK ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kin-Chan Chen

**Art Unit**

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verhaverbeke (US 5,972,123) or David et al. (US 6,015,505) as evidenced by Adetutu et al. (US 6,902,969) or Gilmer et al. (US 2004/0191974).

In a method for wet etching a metal layer, Verhaverbeke (col. 3, lines 25-28; col. 4, lines 21-24, 51-54; col. 5, lines 30-32) or David et al. (abstract; col. 6) teaches that a metal layer (including a metal recited in instant claim 23) may be formed on a substrate. The metal layer has a thickness. The metal layer may be exposed to a wet etch chemistry such as a chelating agent (e.g., EDTA). Verhaverbeke or David is not particular about the thickness of metal being etched. Hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use the desired thickness depending on the particular product requirement, and **it is common in the art of semiconductor device fabrication that thin metal layer may be less than about 50 angstroms, see Adetutu et al. (US 6,902,969) or Gilmer et al. (US 2004/0191974) as evidence.** Since

Art Unit: 1765

same chelating agent is used as an active ingredient in the wet etchant, it is expected that the diameter of the active ingredient exceed the thickness of the metal layer.

3. Claims 6-15 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verhaverbeke (US 5,972,123) or David et al. (US 6,015,505) in view of Adetutu et al. (US 6,902,969) or Gilmer et al. (US 2004/0191974).

In a method for wet etching a metal layer, Verhaverbeke (col. 3, lines 25-28; col. 4, lines 21-24, 51-54; col. 5, lines 30-32) or David et al. (abstract; col. 6) teaches that a metal layer (including a metal recited in instant claim 23) may be formed on a substrate. The metal layer has a thickness. The metal layer may be exposed to a wet etch chemistry such as a chelating agent (e.g., EDTA). Verhaverbeke or David is not particular about the thickness of metal being etched. Hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use the desired thickness depending on the particular product requirement, and it is common in the art of semiconductor device fabrication that thin metal layer may be less than about 50 angstroms, see Adetutu et al. (US 6,902,969) or Gilmer et al. (US 2004/0191974) as evidence. Since same chelating agent is used as an active ingredient in the wet etchant, it is expected that the diameter of the active ingredient exceed the thickness of the metal layer.

Verhaverbeke or David is not limited to any particular structure of semiconductor device being etched, but teaches using wet etching method for integrate circuits (col. 4, lines 51-54). Hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skilled in the art to etch the structures commonly used in the semiconductor device fabrication. In a method for making a semiconductor device, Adetutu (col. 2; col. 3, lines 33-35; col. 5, lines 61-

Art Unit: 1765

65; Figures) or Gilmer ([0005] [0008] [0023] [0025] [0028]; Figures) teaches a high-k gate dielectric layer may be formed on a substrate. A metal layer may be formed thereon. The first metal layer may be less than about 50 angstroms. The first portion of the first metal layer may be removed. A second metal layer may be formed on the high-k gate dielectric, the first portion of the second metal layer covering the remaining portion of the first metal layer and a second portion of the second metal layer covering the high-k gate dielectric layer. The second metal layer may be less than about 100 angstroms thick (or 50 angstroms). A masking layer may be formed, the metal may be wet etched. Hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use the wet etch method and etchant to etch the structure of Adetutu or Gilmer because it is a well-known structure in the art of semiconductor device fabrication and because it is disclosed by Adetutu or Gilmer. As to the materials for the metal layer, Adetutu ( col. 5, lines 61-65) teaches various materials may be used for p-channel gate or n-channel gate, hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use any common p-type metals and n-type metals, and Gilmer ([0008]) discloses various common p-type metals and n-type metals for CMOS.

The claimed invention differs from the prior art by specifying well-known features (such as using polysilicon as mask in claims 9 and 11) to the art of semiconductor device fabrication (the examiner takes official notice) and using various concentrations of the ingredient of etchant (e.g., moles/liter of a chelating agent). However, same is known to be result effective variable and commonly determined by routine experiment. The process of conducting routine experimentations (optimizations)

Art Unit: 1765

so as to produce an expected result is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In the absence of showing criticality or unexpected results, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify prior art by performing routine experiments (by using various concentrations) to obtain optimal result and adding same well-known feature to same in order to provide effective masking with a reasonable expectation of success. It is noted that applicant did not traverse the aforementioned conventionality (e.g., well-known features, common knowledge, obviousness), which have been stated in the previous office action (August 3, 2005).

The above-cited claims (e.g., claims 13 and 14) differ from the prior art by specifying work functions (e.g., 3.9 eV- 4.2eV; 4.9eV –5.2eV) of the metal layer. However, since n-type metal and p-type metal may be used in the prior art, same work functions (e.g., 3.9 eV- 4.2eV; 4.9eV –5.2eV) of the metal layer would be expected.

The above-cited claims (e.g., claim 25) differ from the prior art by specifying the diameter of the active ingredient exceed the thickness of the metal layer thereby preventing the active ingredient from significantly undercutting the metal layer underneath the masking layer. However, because the same materials are used with the same process, it is expected that the method of the combined prior art would contain the same properties and functions as claimed.

***When the examiner has reason to believe that functional language asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in claimed subject matter may, in fact be an inherent characteristic of the prior art as discussed above, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown in the prior art does not possess the characteristics relied upon. Whether the rejection is based on "inherency" under 35 U.S.C. §102, or on "prima facie obviousness" under 35 U.S.C. §103, jointly or alternatively. In re Fitzgerald et al. 205 USPQ 594.***

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that the prior art does not teach that the diameter of the active ingredient exceeds the thickness of the metal layer thereby the undercut of the metal layer under a masking layer is mitigated, inhibiting a significant isotropic undercut etch. It is not persuasive. As has been stated in the office action, it is common in the art of semiconductor device fabrication that thin metal layer may be less than about 50 angstroms, see Adetutu et al. (US 6,902,969) or Gilmer et al. (US 2004/0191974) as evidence. Since same chelating agent is used as an active ingredient in the wet etchant, it is expected that the diameter of the active ingredient exceed the thickness of the metal layer. As such, the same materials are used with the same process, it is expected that the method of the combined prior art would contain the same properties and functions as claimed.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 16-20 allowed.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kin-Chan Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1461. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published



Art Unit: 1765

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*November 3, 2005*



Kin-Chan Chen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1765